

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Please amend Figs. 13-17 as indicated on the enclosed copy thereof. Figs. 13-17 have been amended to indicate their status as Prior Art.

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the pending Office Action, Applicant has amended the Title of the Invention to more fully describe the subject matter of the invention. Furthermore, Applicant has amended the Specification to include two separate subsections Field of the Invention and Description of the Related Art under the Background of the Invention section in order to comply with the preferred layout of a specification. In addition, Figs. 13-17 have been amended to indicate their status as Prior Art.

The Examiner has objected to Figs. 2A, 2B, 4A, 4B, 6A, 6B, 8A and 17 for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they are missing I/O pins or connections. However, Figs. 2A, 2B, 4A, 4B, 6A, 6B, 8A and 17 represent simplified drawings in order to show the wiring between C11 and C12. The I/O pins are omitted in order to more clearly show the wire length and distance between adjacent wires which have an important influence for crosstalk. As such, there is no need to illustrate the I/O pins in any of the aforementioned drawings. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to Figs. 2A, 2B, 4A, 4B, 6A, 6B, 8A and 17 be withdrawn. No new matter has been added.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art.

II. The Rejection Of Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ikeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,198,986). Applicant respectfully submits that Ikeda et al. fails to anticipate the pending claim for at least the following reasons.

With regard to the present invention, claim 1 discloses a crosstalk checking method comprising the steps of extracting a parallel line length between adjacent lines by inputting a layout, and further, inputting a reference value per pitch describing restriction values of parallel line length different according to a line pitch; and calculating the line pitch with respect to the adjacent lines extracted in the parallel line length between the adjacent lines with the reference value per pitch, and thus, determining a portion at which crosstalk occurs in the case where the parallel line length is greater.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Ikeda et al. discloses a crosstalk checking method that discloses information such as obtaining the size of a transistor “W/L” (col. 5, lines 21-23), area “S” of overlapping portion and the length “l” of the effective parallel portion (col. 7, lines 3-21). However, Ikeda fails to disclose the step of calculating the line pitch with respect to the adjacent lines extracted in the parallel line length between the adjacent lines with the reference value per pitch.

The line pitch with respect to the adjacent lines recited in claim 1 is an important factor for considering the crosstalk occurring between adjacent signal lines. In general, the larger a line pitch of adjacent signal lines is, the less the influence of the crosstalk of the signal lines will be. The application discusses exemplary advantages of the present invention on page 8, lines 6-16 of the specification,

“With this configuration, since there is provided the restriction value of the parallel line length *according to the line pitch between the adjacent lines* (i.e., the reference value per pitch), the portion, which has been corrected by using the restriction value of the uniform parallel line length in the prior art, is free from correction. Consequently, it is possible to suppress needless cell insertion or cell sizing, so as to reduce the number of processing man-hours. Furthermore, it is possible to suppress an increase in area or electric power consumption.”

The foregoing makes clear that the present invention provides an improvement over known prior art techniques.

As anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each element of the claim in issue be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference, *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 USPQ 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983), and at a minimum, Ikeda does not disclose the step of calculating the line pitch with respect to the adjacent lines extracted in the parallel line length between the adjacent lines with the reference value per pitch, it is clear that Ikeda et al. does not anticipate claim 1.

III. Conclusion

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

Application No.: 10/695,935

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF/NDM:kap
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: January 31, 2006

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**